



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

IFW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,278	07/18/2003	Anne E. Spinks	99-113-US-02	2410
7590	09/09/2005		EXAMINER	
ALLISON JOHNSON, P.A. 2925 DEAN PARKWAY SUITE 300 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55416			LONEY, DONALD J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1772	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED
OPE/IAP
SEP 19 2005

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/623,278	SPINKS, ANNE E.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Donald Loney	1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/14/03.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

2. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6602444. This is a double patenting rejection.

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1, 2 and 4-13 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6602444. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both contain similar polyalphaolefin-adsorbent compositions wherein in the Patent claim 3 was inserted into claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ferri (6212756).

Ferri teaches the recited composition (polyalphaolefin and adsorbent) coated on a metal spacer used to seal insulating glazing units. Refer to the Abstract, column 3, lines 57-67, column 4, lines 1-13, column 11, lines 31-52, column 13, lines 42-58, column 14, lines 1-18 and column 15, lines 15-39.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1, 2, 6, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lancesseur et al (5432214).

Lancesseur discloses a composition containing a polyalphaolefin and adsorbent.

The adsorbent is in the amount of 20-50% by weight. Refer to column 1, lines 36-61.

Claims 12 and 13, drawn to "consisting essentially of" are included since the applicant from page 2, line 21 of the specification is attempting to exclude polyisobutylene and butyl rubber from the recited composition using said limitation. Also, from MPEP section 2111.03, for the purposes of searching for and applying prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, absent a clear indication in the specification or claims of what the basic and novel characteristics actually are, "consisting essentially of" will be construed as equivalent to "comprising." See, e.g., PPG, 156 F.3d at 1355, 48 USPQ2d at 1355.

9. Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lafond (5436040).

Lafond discloses a composition containing a polyalphaolefin and an adsorbent as recited. This composition is used in insulating glazing units per claim10. Refer to the figures and column 2, lines 43-46, column 3, lines 24-33 and column 5, lines 1-52.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 3-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lancessuer.

The primary reference teaches the invention substantially as recited except for the specific flow rates recited. Lancessuer is silent as to said property. See the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection above.

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to Lancesuer to form a composition with the above flow rate in order to impart the desired properties thereto for its particular application, absence a showing of unexpected results. It also would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the composition in glazing units motivated by the fact dehydrating compositions are used in this field. See Lafond as a teaching reference to the fact.

12. Claims 3-5, 7-9 and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lafond.

The primary reference teaches the invention substantially as recited except for the specific flow rates recited. See the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection above.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to Lafond to form a composition with the above flow rate in order to impart the desired properties thereto for its particular application, especially since it is known to be used in the glazing art field, absence a showing of unexpected results.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald Loney whose telephone number is (571) 272-1493. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Tues, Thurs and Fri. 8AM-4PM, flex schedule.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Donald Loney
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1772

DJL:D.Loney
09/06/05


INFORMATION DISCLOSURE CITATION
(Use several sheets if necessary)

OCT 14 2003

Docket Number (Optional) 99-113-US-02		Application Number 10/623,278
Applicant(s) Anne E. Spinks		
Filing Date 7/18/2003	Group Art Unit 1772	

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL	REF	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
✓		3,965,215	6/22/76	Lopez et al.			
✓		4,045,041	8/30/77	Stenmark et al.			
✓		4,109,431	8/29/78	Mazzoni et al.			
✓		4,197,381	4/8/80	Alia			
✓		4,198,254	4/15/80	Laroche et al.			
✓		4,226,063	10/7/80	Chenel			
✓		4,431,691	2/14/84	Greenlee			
✓		4,622,249	11/11/86	Bowser			
✓		4,994,309	2/19/91	Reichert et al.			
✓		5,503,884	4/2/96	Meyer et al.			
✓		5,509,984	4/23/96	Meyer et al.			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

REF	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	Translation	
						YES	NO
✓	WO 96/37,289	11/28/96	PCT				
✓	EP 0 475 213 A1	3/18/92	Europe				

OTHER DOCUMENTS (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)

✓		Edgetech I.G. Ltd.; Technical Report; "Super Spacer" by Michael Glover, Gerhard Reichert; September 1989; 32 pages

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED
D. <i>Buy</i>	9/6/05

EXAMINER: Initial if citation considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP Section 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Notice of References Cited		Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination	
		10/623,278	SPINKS, ANNE E.	
Examiner		Art Unit		Page 1 of 1
Donald Loney		1772		

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-5,432,214	07-1995	Lancesseur, Didier	524/12
	B	US-5,436,040	07-1995	Lafond, Luc	428/34
	C	US-6,212,756	04-2001	Ferri, Louis Anthony	29/527.1
	D	US-6,602,444	08-2003	Spinks, Anne E.	252/194
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.